

## **REMARKS**

Claims 5, 28, 30 and 32 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

### **Objections To The Drawings**

The objection to the drawings regarding the illustration of instructions as recited in the independent claims has been overcome by appropriate amendment. New Figure 69 has been added, illustrating an example of a cartridge containing instructions. This new Figure is supported by the specification, for example at p.3, lines 5-7, 10-13, 16-17, 23-25 and 29-30; at p.4, lines 1-3, 7-8, 11-13, 17-19 and 23-25; and at p.5, lines 4-6, 22-25 and 29-31. No new matter has been added.

The objection to the drawings regarding the illustration of containers being packaged and grouped together is respectfully traversed. Figure 54 of the application as filed illustrates a package of cartridges. This figure is specifically referred to in the specification on page 34, lines 1-11.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4-8, 21-26, 28-30 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bonk (U.S. Patent No. 4,101,026) in view of Ulmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,257,410). The Office Action asserts that Bonk discloses a container having four sides, a bottom, asymmetric protrusions, a lip, a notch and a coreless roll of moistened wipes. The Office Action asserts that Ulmann et al. discloses that it is well known to place instructions on a package of a roll of moistened wipes, and that it would therefore be obvious to modify the container of Bonk by providing instructions on the container.

The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bonk and Ulmann et al. is respectfully traversed. The applied references, alone or in combination, fail to provide each and every element of the claims. Applicants respectfully point out that the Office Action's correlations of elements of Bonk with the claimed aspects of the container are not consistent with the disclosure of the reference. In addition, the Office

Action's representation of the disclosure of Ulmann et al. is not consistent with the written description in the reference, nor would the combination of Bonk and Ulmann et al. provide each and every element of the claims.

Claims 4-8, 21-26, 28-30 and 32-34 recite a method including providing instructions for the placement of a container in a wet wipes dispenser. The Office Action asserts that Ulmann et al. discloses providing instructions "on a package 12 of a roll of moistened wipes." Applicants respectfully point out that Ulmann et al. discloses only the printing of instructions directly on a wound substrate (col. 5, lines 45-65; and Figure 2). There is no teaching or suggestion in Ulmann et al. of the placement of instructions on a package that would contain the product. Moreover, the use of the wound roll of substrate of Ulmann et al. in the structure of Bonk would not accomplish the provision of instructions as recited in the claims. Any markings on the wound roll of substrate of Ulmann et al. would be concealed when placed in the structure of Bonk. It would thus be impossible to provide instructions for placement of the container if the necessary markings are hidden within the container. Accordingly, Claims 4-8, 21-26, 28-30 and 32-34 are not obvious over Bonk and Ulmann et al. as the references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

In addition to the recitation of providing instructions, independent claims 4, 21, 30 and 34 each recite that the manufactured container is asymmetric. Dependent claims 5 and 6 further recite that this asymmetry is related to the protrusions on the sides of the container, and claim 6 recites that these protrusions provide a "keyed" fit with the dispenser. The asymmetry of a container of wet wipes and the relation of this asymmetry to the "keyed" arrangement between the container and a dispenser is described in the specification, for example at page 15, lines 14-31. The term "symmetrical" is defined on lines 21-23:

An object is considered symmetrical if there can be a plane which passes through the object such that the portions on either side of the plane are reflections of each other.

The specification further provides examples of asymmetry in the context of wipes containers (p.15, lines 24-31; and Figure 2). When such asymmetric containers are used with a dispenser having an asymmetric opening, it is possible for the container and the dispenser to fit together in a manner similar to a lock and key. A "keyed" fit between the container and the dispenser can assure that a roll of wipes in the container will unwind from a predetermined orientation, i.e., from the bottom of the roll or the top of the roll.

In contrast, the protrusions of Bonk do not provide any asymmetry to the container as defined in Applicants' specification. Flange 23 (col. 7, lines 59-62) and shoulders 52-53 (col. 7, lines 8-12, 15-18) and 57 (col. 7, lines 24-25) of Bonk extend uniformly around the entire perimeter of the structure. The resulting symmetrical configuration of these elements is emphasized by Figures 4 and 5 of Bonk, in that the "lines 5—5 of FIG. 4" define a plane of reflection that passes through the structure. Thus, Bonk does not teach or suggest an asymmetric container as described by Applicants. Likewise, Ulmann et al. does not teach or suggest, nor does the Office Action assert that Ulmann et al. teaches or suggests, an asymmetric container.


It is noted that, as amended, claims 28, 30 and 32 each recite that the wipes dispenser, into which the container can be placed, comprises a cover. This amendment is supported by original claims 35, 38-40 and 47-49, and by the specification, at least at page 13, line 3 through page 14, line 31 and at page 34, lines 1-11. The Office Action asserts that the holder 22 of Bonk is a dispenser; however, this holder is a simple bracket and does not contain a cover as recited in claims 28, 30 and 32. Likewise, Ulmann et al. does not teach or suggest, nor does the Office Action assert that Ulmann et al. teaches or suggests, a dispenser comprising a cover.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, all of the grounds raised in the present Office Action for rejecting the application are believed to be overcome or rendered moot based on the remarks above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently presented claims are in form for allowance, and such action is requested in due course. Should the Examiner feel a discussion would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

5/20/03

  
Jonathan P. Taylor, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 48,338  
Agent for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200